REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated August 19, 2005, claims 1-36 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-36 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Morley et al. in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary 4th ed. (1999), and further in view of Carey. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 11, 19, and 29 variously recite methods of, and systems comprising objects for, transferring data in a multithreaded analytic application executed by a source computer system and capable of concurrent execution of multiple session threads comprising, among other things *"spawning a session thread,"* and *"concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread"* the data transformation threads comprising *"a reader thread that reads data and writes ... to a first data block buffer,"* *"a compressor thread"* or *"decompressor thread"* that de/compresses ...data ...and writes the de/compressed data block to a ...buffer, a *"decryptor thread"* or *"encryptor thread"* that decrypts/encrypts...data into a(n) decrypted/encrypted and de/compressed data block and writes the...to a... buffer, and *"a writer thread that reads...and sends..."* These aspects of

11

the claimed invention enable substantial increases in the speed of the transfer of data and establish a unique thread organization.

As the Examiner correctly notes, the combination of Morley and Microsoft does not disclose "concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread." (Office Action, Pg. 5, ln. 1-2)

The deficient disclosure of Morley and Microsoft is not remedied by Carey. The Examiner asserts that because Carey "discloses that a multi-thread model has been well-known to those within the art... it would have been obvious, therefore, to one of ordinary skill in the [art] at the time of the invention to use the multi-thread model for processes such as encryption, decryption, compression, decompression, reading, and writing..." (Office Action, Pg. 5, ln. 4-6.)

Applicants respectfully disagree. The processes of compression, encryption, decryption, and decompression ordinarily occur in a sequence and thus require the completion of an earlier process in the sequence before the commencement of a later process in the sequence. Carey does not disclose concurrently executing these processes within a single session thread, and the Examiner does not provide any other reference to support this claim. At best, Carey discloses that the different processes of compression, encryption, decryption, and decompression can be executed in separate threads, but not in a single thread, as claimed.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that Morley discloses "spawning a session thread that reads and parses a command received via the incoming request, the command for sending the data to a second computer system." An examination of Morley in its entirety does not yield any suggestion of either spawning session threads or

receiving an incoming request. In addition, the specific text cited by the Examiner to support this assertion (para. 54-55, Fig. 2) describe a method for converting film and audio data to digital format and a "high-level block diagram of an embodiment of the digital cinema apparatus." Therefore, Morley does not disclose this element. Furthermore, Microsoft and Carey do not remedy this shortcoming of Morley, nor does the Examiner assert that they do.

Further, even if the references disclose what the Examiner relies on them for, the combination does not disclose every element of the claimed invention. At best, the combination would suggest a system for distributing compressed and encrypted audio and video data that uses buffers and multiple threads in some capacity. This system would not disclose executing multiple transformative threads concurrently within a session thread as claimed, and would not provide the benefit of substantial increase in the speed of data transfer Thus, claims 1, 11, 19, and 29 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-28, and 30-36 variously depend from their respective base claims, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited references. In addition, these claims recite additional limitations also not disclosed by the cited references. Thus, claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-28, and 30-36 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 through 36, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 15, 2005   By: _____

Attorneys for Assignee
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200

23402/09419/DOCS/1561766.8